

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
9 FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
10

11 SOLOMON FARR,

12 Plaintiff,

No. CIV S-05-0847 GEB DAD PS

13 vs.

14 CITY OF FAIRFIELD, et al.,

15 Defendants.

ORDER

16 _____/
17 Plaintiff, proceeding pro se, filed the above-entitled
18 action. The matter was referred to a United States Magistrate
19 Judge pursuant to Local Rule 72-302(c)(21).

20 On June 7, 2005, the magistrate judge filed findings
21 and recommendations herein which contained notice to plaintiff
22 that any objections to the findings and recommendations were to
23 be filed within twenty days.

24 Although plaintiff failed to file objections to the
25 findings and recommendations, it is unclear whether plaintiff has
26 been served with documents in this case. When plaintiff

1 submitted his Application to Proceed In Forma Pauperis ("IFP
2 Application") and his Complaint, each document had a different
3 address. The address in the IFP Application has been the address
4 used for service. Service should be attempted to the address on
5 Plaintiff's Complaint.

6 Therefore, the Clerk of Court is ordered to re-serve
7 the Order filed April 29, 2005, at the address on plaintiff's
8 Complaint.

9 IT IS SO ORDERED.

10 Dated: July 22, 2005

11
12 /s/ Garland E. Burrell, Jr.
13 GARLAND E. BURRELL, JR.
14 United States District Judge
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26